

## **REMARKS**

### **Objections**

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for not showing “an insulating layer” recited in claims 5 and 24 and “a mask” as recited in Claims 11, 12, 32 and 33.

35 U.S.C. §1.81(a) states that, “The applicant for a patent is required to furnish a drawing of his and her invention where necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented. . .”

The Applicants submits that masking techniques and the application of insulating layers to provide electrical isolation are well known by one of ordinary skill in the art. (See for example the references cited by the Applicant and Examiner.) The Applicant further notes that since the masks are removed after applying the desired (e.g. electrode, light-emitting polymer, etc.) layer, the finished organic light-emitting device, as depicted in Figs. 1 and 2, no longer comprises the mask.

The Applicant submits that since illustration of an insulating layer and a mask are not necessary for understanding, illustration is not required. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

The Examiner alleged that it is not clear whether “a direction” in Claims 1, 24, 32 and 33 refers to the direction of travel of the flexible substrate or the direction of width of the flexible substrate.”

The Applicant submits that the ordinary meaning of the word “advancing” means “to move or cause to move forward”. Accordingly, “a direction” clearly refers to the direction of movement of the web.” For roll-to-roll processes, as described at p. 3, lines 24-29, the flexible substrate web is provided in a roll. The direction of movement of the web is parallel to the edge of the roll, such as shown in Fig 1. Dependent Claims 34-36 have been added to specifically recite this feature.

**§ 102 & § 103 Rejections**

Claims 1-4, 14-20 and 22-23 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cok (US 6936964).

Claims 5-8, 10-13 and 21 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok (US 6936964) in view of Weaver (US 6664730).

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cok (US 6936964) in view of Mikheal et al. (US 6649433).

Claims 24-29 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weaver (US 6664730) in view of Mikheal et al. (US 6649433).

Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over McCormick et al. (US 6649433).

Independent claims 24, 32, and 33 have been amended to recite that “the first and second electrode layer are continuous in the direction of the advancing web”. In view of such amendments, the rejections under 35 USC § 103(a) are now moot.

The remaining rejections are based on Cok (U.S. Patent No. 6,936,964) alone or Cok in combination with a secondary reference. In view of the attached 35 U.S.C. § 1.131 Declaration, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections based on Cok be withdrawn.

The Applicant has responded to all the rejections set forth by the Examiner. A timely allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

July 17, 2006

Date

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

By:           /Carolyn A. Fischer/

Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091

Telephone No.: 651-575-3915